

**CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY OF THE  
SECESSIONVILLE ROAD TRACT  
CHARLESTON COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA**



**CHICORA RESEARCH CONTRIBUTION 458**

# **CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY OF THE SECESSIONVILLE ROAD TRACT CHARLESTON COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA**

Prepared By:  
Michael Trinkley, Ph.D., RPA  
and  
Nicole Southerland

Prepared For:  
Mr. Joe Margarite  
1369 Tidal Creek Cove  
Charleston, SC 29412

**CHICORA RESEARCH CONTRIBUTION 458**



Chicora Foundation, Inc.  
PO Box 8664  
Columbia, SC 29202-8664  
803/787-6910  
[www.chicora.org](http://www.chicora.org)

October 27, 2006

This report is printed on permanent paper ∞

©2006 by Chicora Foundation, Inc. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted, or transcribed in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without prior permission of Chicora Foundation, Inc. except for brief quotations used in reviews. Full credit must be given to the authors, publisher, and project sponsor.

## ABSTRACT

This study reports on an intensive cultural resources survey of a 4.5 acre tract located on James Island in Charleston County, South Carolina. The work was conducted to assist Mr. Joe Margarite comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the regulations codified in 36CFR800.

The tract, which borders Secessionville Road to the east, will be developed for single family occupancy. The surrounding area is being quickly developed with neighborhoods and commercial structures.

The proposed undertaking will require the clearing of the tract, followed by construction of various infrastructure elements, such as roads, stormwater drainage, and utilities. Individual lot construction will involve grading, additional utility construction, and subsequent building of structures. These activities have the potential to affect archaeological and historical sites and this survey was conducted to identify and assess archaeological and historical sites that may be in the project tract. For this study an area of potential effect (APE) 0.5 mile around the proposed tract was assumed.

An investigation of the archaeological site files at the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology identified three sites (38CH507, 38CH1514, and 38CH1515) in the APE. Site 38CH507 is Confederate Battery 5, which is on the National Register. The other two sites, 38CH1514 and 38CH1515 are shell middens that were recommended not eligible for the National Register.

The maps at the S.C. Department of Archives and History were also consulted to see if any National Register of Historic Places sites were in the vicinity of the project area. Two National Register Districts, Secessionville and a Civil War

Battery (Number 5, which is within 0.5 mile of the project area) are within 1.0 mile of the project area. Neither district, however, is within sight of the project tract. One additional Civil War Battery (#4) was once located within 0.5 of the survey area, however it has been destroyed by development. In addition, seven architectural sites (1324-1327.02 and 1367) have been identified within the APE from a survey on James Island (Fick et al. 1989). Site 1324 is a house on Grimball Road; 1325 is a house at 1550 Grimball Road; 1326 is the W.L. Limehouse House on Folly Road (which is potentially eligible for the National Register); 1327 is the Halter House, which has components 1327.01 – now the Stewart House and 1327.02 – now an office for the Halter's; 1367 is a house on Grimball Road. No additional information was given on the GIS for the resources, however, with the exception of site 1326, all resources were recommended not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

The archaeological survey of the tract incorporated shovel testing at 100-foot intervals on transects which were placed at 100-foot intervals. All shovel test fill was screened through ¼-inch mesh and the shovel tests were backfilled at the completion of the study. A total of 20 shovel tests were excavated along 10 transect lines.

As a result of these investigations, no sites were identified. This is likely the result of the lack of well drained soils. The absence of historic sites is likely also related to the tract's distance from the river – the primary transportation route during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

Finally, it is possible that archaeological remains may be encountered in the project area during clearing activities. Crews should be advised to report any discoveries of concentrations of artifacts (such as bottles, ceramics, or projectile points) or brick rubble to

the project engineer, who should in turn report the material to the State Historic Preservation Office or to Chicora Foundation (the process of dealing with late discoveries is discussed in 36CFR800.13(b)(3)). No construction should take place in the vicinity of these late discoveries until they have been examined by an archaeologist and, if necessary, have been processed according to 36CFR800.13(b)(3).

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures		iv
Introduction		1
Natural Environment		5
<i>Physiography</i>	5	
<i>Geology and Soils</i>	5	
<i>Climate</i>	6	
<i>Floristics</i>	7	
Prehistoric and Historic Background		9
<i>Previous Research</i>	9	
<i>Prehistoric Synopsis</i>	9	
<i>Historic Background</i>	11	
Research Methods and Findings		17
<i>Archaeological Field Methods and Findings</i>	17	
<i>Architectural Survey</i>	18	
<i>Site Evaluation and Findings</i>	18	
Conclusions		21
Sources Cited		23

## LIST OF FIGURES

### Figure

1. Project vicinity in Charleston County	2
2. Project tract and previously identified sites	3
3. View of typical vegetation in the survey area	5
4. View of one of the drainages in the project area	6
5. Some grassed areas adjacent to existing structures	7
6. Generalized cultural sequence for South Carolina	10
7. Portion of the 1780 <i>A Sketch of the Environs of Charleston in South Carolina</i>	13
8. Portion of Mills' <i>Atlas</i> showing the project area on James Island	14
9. Portion of Bache's "Charleston Harbour and the Adjacent Coast and Country"	14
10. Portion of the 1919 James Island topographic map showing the project area	15
11. Portion of the 1942 <i>General Highway and Transportation Map of Charleston County</i>	16
12. Project area with transects	17
13. View of structures adjacent to the project area	18
14. Shovel testing in the project area	19

## INTRODUCTION

This investigation was conducted by Dr. Michael Trinkley of Chicora Foundation, Inc. for Mr. Joe Margarite in Charleston, South Carolina. The work was conducted to assist the client with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the regulations codified in 36CFR800.

The project site consists of a 4.5 acre tract proposed to be used for residential development in James Island, South Carolina (Figure 1). The tract is bounded by Secessionville Road to the east.

The tract consists of level topography with drainage ditches throughout. Also found in the area are forests of mixed pines and hardwoods. The surrounding area is being quickly developed.

The tract is intended for a residential development. This work will require the construction of utilities such as electrical, sewer, and water lines as well as an expanded road system when development begins. There will likely be increased short-term noise, traffic, and dust levels associated with the project. These activities have the potential to damage or otherwise affect any cultural resources that may be present on the tract.

This study, however, does not consider any future secondary impact of the project, including increased or expanded development of this portion of Charleston County.

We were asked to provide a proposal for a Cultural Resources Survey on October 12, 2006. A proposal was sent the same day. The proposal was accepted and the Services Agreement was issued on October 16, which served as a notice to proceed.

Initial background investigations incorporated a review of the site files at the South

Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology. As a result of that work, three sites (38CH507, 38CH1514, and 38CH1515) were identified. Site 38CH507 is Battery 5, which is on the National Register. The other two sites, 38CH1514 and 38CH1515 are shell middens that were recommended not eligible for the National Register.

Examination of architectural sites at the South Carolina Department of Archives and History identified two NRHP sites (the Secessionville Historic District and a Civil War Battery (#5) within the 1.0 mile APE. Neither, however, is within sight of the project tract. One additional Civil War Battery (#4) was located within 0.5 of the survey area, however it has been destroyed by development. In addition, seven architectural sites (1324-1327.02 and 1367) have been identified within the APE from a survey on James Island (Fick et al. 1989). Site 1324 is a house on Grimball Road; 1325 is a house at 1550 Grimball Road; 1326 is the W.L. Limehouse House on Folly Road (which is potentially eligible for the National Register); 1327 is the Halter House, which has components 1327.01 – now the Stewart House and 1327.02 – now an office for the Halter's; 1367 is a house on Grimball Road. No additional information, such as the construction date, was given on the GIS for the resources, however, with the exception of site 1326, all resources were recommended not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Archival and historical research was limited to a review of secondary sources available in the Chicora Foundation files.

The archaeological survey for the tract was conducted on October 23, 2006 by Ms. Julie Poppell, and Ms. Kim Igou under the direction of



The map displays Charleston County, South Carolina, with major roads and water bodies. A scale bar at the bottom indicates distances up to 20 miles. A black arrow points to the 'Project Area' near Charleston Harbor. The map also shows various islands and inlets, including Edisto Island, Folly Island, and Hunting Island.





Dr. Michael Trinkley.

This report details the investigation of the project area undertaken by Chicora Foundation and the results of that investigation.



## NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

### Physiography

Charleston County is located in the lower Atlantic Coastal Plain of South Carolina and is bounded to the east by the Atlantic Ocean and a series of marsh, barrier, and sea islands (Mathews et al. 1980:133). Elevations in the County range from sea level to about 70 feet above mean sea level (AMSL).

In the project area, elevations are about 10 feet AMSL. In general, the topography is very level with various drainages constructed throughout.

The mainland topography consists of similar subtle ridge and bay undulations, characteristic of beach ridge plains. Seven major drainages are found in Charleston County. Four of these, the Wando, Ashley, Stono, and North Edisto, are dominated by tidal flows and are saline. The three drainages with significant freshwater flow are the Santee, forming the northern boundary of the County, the South Edisto, forming the southern boundary, and the Cooper, which bisects the County.

Because of the low topography, many broad, low gradient interior drains are present as either extensions of the tidal rivers or as flooded bays and swales. Extensions include Seaside and Secessionville creeks, which flow into Clark Sound and into the Ashley River.

### Geology and Soils

Coastal

Plain

geological formations are unconsolidated sedimentary deposits of very recent age (Pleistocene and Holocene) lying unconformably on ancient crystalline rocks (Cooke 1936; Miller 1971:74). The Pleistocene sediments are organized into topographically distinct, but lithologically similar, geomorphic units, or terraces, parallel to the coast. The sites are located in an area identified by Cooke (1936) as part of the Pamlico terrace, which includes the land between the recent shore and an abandoned shore line about 25 feet AMSL. Cooke (1936:7) notes that evidence of ancient beaches and swales can still be seen in the Pamlico formation and this likely contributed to the ridge and trough topography present in some areas.

Within the coastal zone, the soils are Holocene and Pleistocene in age and were formed from materials that were deposited during the various stages of coastal submergence. The formation of soils is affected by this parent material (primarily sands and clays), the temperate climate, the various soil organisms,



Figure 3. View of typical vegetation in the survey area.



Figure 4. View of one of the drainages in the project area.

topography, and time.

The mainland soils are Pleistocene in age and tend to have more distinct horizon development and diversity than the younger soils of the sea and barrier islands. Sandy to loamy soils predominate in the level to gently sloping mainland areas. The island soils are less diverse and less well developed, frequently lacking a well-defined B horizon. Organic matter is low and the soils tend to be acidic. The Holocene deposits typical of barrier islands and found as a fringe on some sea islands, consist almost entirely of quartz sand, which exhibits little organic matter. Tidal marsh soils are Holocene in age and consist of fine sands, clay, and organic matter deposited over older Pleistocene sands. The soils are frequently covered by up to 2 feet of saltwater during high tides. Historically, marsh soils have been used as compost or fertilizer for a variety of crops, including cotton (Hammond 1884:510) and Allston mentions that the sandy soil of the coastal region "bears well the admixture of salt and marsh mud with the compost" (Allston 1854:13).

Only two soil series occur in the project area: Seabrook loamy fine sand and Kiawah loamy fine sand (Miller 1971). The moderately well drained Seabrook soils have an Ap horizon of

very dark grayish brown (10YR3/2) loamy fine sand to a depth of 0.8 foot over a dark brown (10YR4/3) loamy fine sand to 1.7 feet in depth. The somewhat poorly drained Kiawah soils have an Ap horizon of very dark grayish brown (10YR3/2) loamy fine sand to 0.7 foot in depth over a dark grayish brown (10YR4/2) loamy fine sand to 1.3 feet in depth.

### Climate

John Lawson described South Carolina in 1700 as having, "a sweet Air, moderate Climate, and fertile Soil" (Lefler 1967:86). Of course, Lawson tended to romanticize Carolina. In December 1740, Robert Pringle remarked that Charleston was having "hard frosts & Snow" characterized as "a great Detriment to the Negroes" (Edgar 1972:282), while in May 1744 Pringle states, "the weather having already Come is very hot" (Edgar 1972:685).

The major climatic controls of the area are latitude, elevation, distance from the ocean, and location with respect to the average tracks of migratory cyclones. Charleston's latitude of 32°37'N places it on the edge of the balmy subtropical climate typical of Florida, further south. As a result, there are relatively short, mild winters and long, warm, humid summers. The large amount of nearby warm ocean water surface produces a marine climate, which tends to moderate both the cold and hot weather. The Appalachian Mountains, about 220 miles to the northwest, block the shallow cold air masses from the northwest, moderating them before they reach the sea islands (Mathews et al. 1980:46).

The average high temperature in Charleston in July is 81°F, although temperatures





Figure 5. Some grassed areas adjacent to existing structures.

are frequently in the 90s during much of July (Kjerfve 1975:C-4). Mills noted:

in the months of June, July, and August, 1752, the weather in Charleston was warmer than any of the inhabitants before had ever experienced. The mercury in the shade often rose above 90°, and for nearly twenty successive days varied between that and 101° (Mills 1972[1826]:444).

The area normally experiences a high relative humidity, adding greatly to the discomfort. Kjerfve (1975:C-5) found an annual mean value of 73.5% RH, with the highest levels occurring during the summer. Pringle remarked in 1742 that guns "suffer'd with the Rust by Lying so Long here, & which affects any Kind of Iron Ware, much more in this Climate than in Europe" (Edgar 1972:465).

The annual rainfall in this portion of Charleston is about 49 inches, fairly evenly spaced over the year. While adequate for most crops, there may be periods of both excessive rain and drought. The Charleston area has recorded up to

20 inches of rain in a single month and the rainfall over a three month period has exceeded 30 inches no less than nine times in the past 37 years. Likewise, periods of drought can occur and cause considerable damage to crops and livestock. Mills remarks that the "Summer of 1728 was uncommonly hot; the face of the earth was completely parched; the pools of standing water dried up, and the field reduced to the greatest distress"

(Mills 1972[1826]:447-448). Another significant historical drought occurred in 1845, affecting both the Low and Up Countries.

The annual growing season is 295 days, one of the longest in South Carolina. This mild climate, adequate rainfall, and long growing season, as Hilliard (1984:13) notes, is largely responsible for the presence of many southern crops, such as cotton and sugar cane.

### Floristics

The survey area exhibits one major ecosystem: the maritime forest, which consists of upland forest areas (Sandifer et al. 1980:7-9).

The maritime forest ecosystem has been found to consist of five principal forest types, including the Oak-Pine forests, the Mixed Oak Hardwood forests, the Palmetto forests, the Oak thickets, and other miscellaneous wooded areas (such as salt marsh thickets and wax myrtle thickets).

Of these, the Oak-Pine forests are most common, constituting large areas of Charleston's

original forest community. In some areas palmetto becomes an important sub-dominant. Typically these forests are dominated by the laurel oak with pine (primarily loblolly with minor amounts of longleaf pine) as the major canopy co-dominant. Hickory is present, although uncommon. Other trees found are the sweet gum and magnolia, with sassafras, red bay, American holly, and wax myrtle and palmetto found in the understory.

Mills, in the early nineteenth century, remarked that:

South Carolina is rich in native and exotic productions; the varieties of its soil, climate, and geological positions, afford plants of rare, valuable, and medicinal qualities; fruits of a luscious, refreshing, and nourishing nature; vines and shrubs of exquisite beauty, fragrance, and luxuriance, and forest trees of noble growth, in great variety (Mills 1972[1826]:66).

The loblolly pine was called the "pitch or Frankincense Pine" and was used to produce tar and turpentine; the longleaf pine was "much used in building and for all other domestic purposes;" trees such as the red bay and red cedar were often used in furniture making and cedar was a favorite for posts; and live oaks were recognized as yielding "the best of timber for ship building;" (Mills 1972[1826]:66-85). Mills also observed that:

in former years cypress was much used in building, but the difficulty of obtaining it now, compared with the pine, occasions little of it to be cut for sale, except in the shape of shingles; the cypress is a most valuable wood for durability and lightness. Besides the two names we have cedar, poplar, beech, oak, and locust, which are or may be also used in building (Mills

1972[1826]:460).

The "Oak and hickory high lands" according to Mills were, "well suited for corn and provisions, also for indigo and cotton" (Mills 1972[1826]:443). The value of these lands in the mid-1820s was from \$10 to \$20 per acre, less expensive than the tidal swamp or inland swamp lands (where rice and, with drainage, cotton could be grown).

Today, virtually all of the site area's higher ground evidences some form or another of disturbance. Most of the trees on the tract are young pines and hardwoods (Figure 3) and several ditches have been dug in the project area, which has likely affected the flow of water on the property.

## PREHISTORIC AND HISTORIC BACKGROUND

### Previous Research

There are a number of previously published archaeological studies available for the Charleston area to provide background (see Derting et al. 1991 for references to research in the Charleston area). Trinkley (1980), for example, provides detailed analysis of excavations at the nearby Lighthouse Point Shell Ring, while Trinkley (1984) provides a brief overview of the archaeology of Sol Legare Island to the south of the current project area.

A survey of Civil War Fortifications is provided by Trinkley and Fick (2000), which located earthworks in Charleston, Beaufort, Berkeley, Hampton, and Jasper counties.

Another archaeological study of interest includes the work at Secessionville, which was listed on the National Register in 1979. An early survey was reported by Brockington and Associates (Butler 1994). Several later projects have also been performed in the area (see, for one example, Trinkley and Hacker 1997). For a view of the Civil War occupation, Brennan (1996) provides detailed background.

### Prehistoric Synopsis

Several previously published archaeological studies are available for the Charleston area that provide additional background, including those previously mentioned. A considerable amount of archaeology has been conducted in the Charleston area and these works should be consulted for broad overviews.

The Paleoindian period, lasting from 12,000 to perhaps 8,000 B.C., is evidenced by basally thinned, side-notched projectile points;

fluted, lanceolate projectile points; side scrapers; end scrapers; and drills (Coe 1964; Michie 1977; Williams 1968). The Paleoindian occupation, while widespread, does not appear to have been intensive. Artifacts are most frequently found along major river drainages, which Michie interprets to support the concept of an economy "oriented towards the exploitation of now extinct mega-fauna" (Michie 1977:124).

The Archaic period, which dates from 8000 to about 1000 B.C., does not form a sharp break with the Paleoindian period, but is a slow transition characterized by a modern climate and an increase in the diversity of material culture. The chronology established by Coe (1964) for the North Carolina Piedmont may be applied with relatively little modification to the South Carolina coast. Archaic period assemblages, characterized by corner-notched and broad stemmed projectile points, are rare in the Sea Island region, although the sea level is anticipated to have been within 13 feet of its present stand by the beginning of the succeeding Woodland period (Lepionka et al. 1983:10).

To some the Woodland period begins, by definition, with the introduction of fired clay pottery about 2000 B.C. along the South Carolina coast. To others, the period from about 2500 to 1000 B.C. falls into the Late Archaic because of a perceived continuation of the Archaic lifestyle in spite of the manufacture of pottery. Regardless of the terminology, the period from 2500 to 1000 B.C. is well documented on the South Carolina coast and is characterized by Stallings (fiber-tempered) and Thom's Creek (sand or non-tempered) series pottery.

The subsistence economy during this early period on the coast of South Carolina was based primarily on deer hunting, fishing, and shellfish



**CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY OF THE SECESSIONVILLE ROAD TRACT**

Dates	Period	Sub-Period	Regional Phases		
			COASTAL	MIDDLE SAVANNAH VALLEY	CENTRAL CAROLINA PIEDMONT
1715	HIST.	EARLY	Altamaha		Caraway
1650	MISS.	LATE	Irene / Pee Dee	Rembert	
1100		EARLY	Savannah	Hollywood	Dan River
				Lawton	Pee Dee
		LATE	St. Catherines / Swift Creek	Savannah	
800	A.D. B.C.		Wilmington	Sand Tempered Wilmington?	Uwharrie
		MIDDLE	Deptford	Deptford	Yadkin
300					
	WOODLAND	EARLY		Refuge	Badin
1000	ARCHAIC			Thom's Creek Stallings	
2000		LATE		Savannah River Halifax	
3000					
		MIDDLE		Guilford Morrow Mountain Stanly	
5000	PALEOINDIAN				
8000		EARLY		Kirk Palmer	
10,000				Hardaway	
				Hardaway - Dalton	
12,000			Cumberland	Clovis	Simpson

Figure 6. Generalized cultural sequence for South Carolina.

collection, with supplemental inclusions of small mammals, birds, and reptiles. Various calculations of the probable yield of deer, fish, and other food sources identified from shell ring sites such as Lighthouse Point on James Island, indicate that sedentary life was not only possible, but probable.

Toward the end of the Thom's Creek phase there is evidence of sea level change, and a number of small, non-shell midden sites are found along the coast. Apparently the rising sea level inundated the tide marshes on which the Thom's

Creek people relied.

The succeeding Refuge phase, which dates from about 1100 to 500 B.C., suggests fragmentation caused by the environmental changes (Lepionka et al. 1983; Williams 1968). Sites are generally small and some coastal sites evidence no shellfish collection at all (Trinkley 1982). Peterson (1971:153) characterizes Refuge as a degeneration of the preceding Thom's Creek series and a bridge to the succeeding Deptford culture.

The Deptford phase, which dates from 1100 B.C. to A.D. 600, is best characterized by fine to coarse sandy paste pottery with a check stamped surface treatment. Also present are quantities of cord marked, simple stamped, and occasional fabric impressed pottery. During this period there is a blending of the Deptford ceramic tradition of the lower Savannah with the Deep Creek tradition found further north along the South Carolina coast and extending into North Carolina (Trinkley 1983).

The Middle Woodland period (ca. 300 B.C. to A.D. 1000) is characterized by the use of sand burial mounds and ossuaries along the Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina coasts (Brooks et al. 1982; Thomas and Larsen 1979; Wilson 1982). Middle Woodland coastal plain sites continue the Early Woodland Deptford pattern of mobility. While sites are found all along the coast and inland to the fall line, sites are characterized by sparse shell and few artifacts. Gone are the abundant shell tools, worked bone items, and clay balls. In many respects the South Carolina Late Woodland period (ca. A.D. 1000 to 1650 in some areas of the coast) may be characterized as a continuum of the previous Middle Woodland cultural assemblage.

The Middle and Late Woodland occupations in South Carolina are characterized by a pattern of settlement mobility and short-term occupations. On the southern coast they are associated with the Wilmington and St. Catherines phases, which date from about A.D. 500 to at least A.D. 1150, although there is evidence that the St. Catherines pottery continued to be produced much later in time (Trinkley 1981). On the northern coast there are very similar ceramics called Hanover and Santee.

The South Appalachian Mississippian period (ca. A.D. 1100 to 1640) is the most elaborate level of culture attained by the native inhabitants and is followed by cultural disintegration brought about largely by European disease. The period is characterized by complicated stamped pottery, complex social organization, agriculture, and the

construction of temple mounds and ceremonial centers. The earliest coastal phases are named Savannah and Irene (A.D. 1200 to 1550). Sometime after the arrival of Europeans on the Georgia coast in A.D. 1519, the Irene phase is replaced by the Altamaha phase. Altamaha pottery tends to be heavily grit tempered, the complicated stamped motifs tend to be rectilinear and poorly applied, and check stamping occurs as a minority ware. Further north, in the Charleston area, the Pee Dee or Irene ware is replaced by pottery with bolder designs, thought to be representative of the protohistoric and historic periods (South 1971).

Although there has been very little archaeological exploration of historic period Native American groups in the Charleston area, South has compiled a detailed overview of the ethnohistoric sources (South 1972).

### **Historic Background**

Just as there are a large number of sources recounting the prehistory of the project area, the history of Charleston County has been extensively reviewed, summarized, and critiqued. There should hardly be any need to do more than point the interested reader in one or two directions for additional information and details. Simple and readily available summaries include *A Short History of Charleston* (Rosen 1982) and *Charleston! Charleston!* (Fraser 1989). An excellent overview has been prepared by Fick and her colleagues as part of Charleston County's historical and architectural survey (Fick 1992).

Although some aspects of the area's history (such as the activities surrounding the Civil War, the defense of Charleston, and the Battle of Secessionville) are well researched, others (such as the postbellum agricultural history of the island) are not nearly as well understood. Nevertheless, we have at least a general idea of the activities surrounding this particular tract.

The English established the first permanent settlement in what is today South Carolina in 1670 on the west bank of the Ashley

River. Like other European powers, the English were lured to the New World for reasons other than the acquisition of land and promotion of agriculture. The Lord Proprietors, who owned the colony until 1719-1720, intended to discover a staple crop whose marketing would provide great wealth through its distribution in the mercantile system.

By 1680 the settlers of Albemarle Point had moved their village across the bay to the tip of the peninsula formed by the Ashley and Cooper rivers. This new settlement at Oyster Point would become modern-day Charleston. The move provided not only a more healthful climate and an area of better defense, but:

[t]he citation of this Town is so convenient for public Commerce that it rather seems to be the design of some skillful Artist than the accidental position of nature (Mathews 1954:153).

Early settlers came from the English West Indies, other mainland colonies, England, and the European continent. It has been argued that those from the English West Indies were the most critical to the future of the colony, as they brought with them a strong agrarian concept, involving both staple crops and, especially, slave labor (Sirmans 1966).

Early agriculture experiments which involved olives, grapes, silkworms, and oranges were less than successful. Ironically, often the climate precluded successful results. While the Indian trade was profitable to many of the Carolina colonists, it did not provide the proprietors with the wealth they were expecting from the new colony. Ranching offered quick, and relatively easy, cash, but again the proprietors resisted such efforts, realizing that the profits they would reap were far smaller than possible from the mercantile system. Consequently, the cultivation of cotton, rice, tobacco, and flax were stressed as these were staple crops whose marketing the proprietors could easily

monopolize.

Cattle raising also was an easy way to exploit the region's land and resources, offering a relatively secure return for very little capital investment. Few slaves were necessary to manage the herd. The mild climate of the low country made winter forage more abundant and winter shelters unnecessary. The salt marshes on the coast, useless for other purposes, provided excellent grazing and eliminated the need to provide salt licks. More interior swamps found similar vegetation and provided a constant water supply (Coon 1972; Dunbar 1961). Production of cattle, hogs, and sheep quickly outstripped local consumption and by the early eighteenth century beef and pork were principal exports of the Colony to the West Indies (Ver Steeg 1975: 114-116). This allowed the ties between Carolina and the Caribbean to remain strong, and provided essential provisions to the large scale, single crop plantations.

Rice and indigo both competed for the attention of Carolina planters. Although introduced at least by the 1690s, rice did not become a significant staple crop until the early eighteenth century. At that time it not only provided the proprietors with an economic base the mercantile system required, but it was also to form the basis of South Carolina's plantation system (Carpenter 1973). Over production soon followed, with a severe decline in prices during the 1740s. This economic down swing encouraged at least some planters to diversify and indigo was introduced (Huneycutt 1949:33). Indigo complemented rice production since they were grown in mutually exclusive areas. Both, however, were labor intensive and encouraged the large scale introduction of slaves.

South Carolina's economic development during the pre-Revolutionary War period involved a complex web of interactions between slaves, planters, and merchants. By 1710 slaves outnumbered free people in South Carolina. By the 1730s, slaves were beginning to be concentrated on a few, large slave-holding




Figure 7. Portion of "Sketch of the Environs of Charlestown in South Carolina" during the American Revolution showing the project area.

plantations. At the close of the eighteenth century some South Carolina plantations had a ratio of slaves to whites that was 27:1 (Morgan 1977). While over half of eastern South Carolina's white population held slaves, few held very large numbers. The Charleston area had a slave population greater than 50% of the total population by 1790. This imbalance between the races, particularly on remote plantations, may have led to greater "freedom" and mobility (Friedlander in Wheaton et al. 1983:34). By the antebellum period this trend was less extreme.

Only certain areas of the low country, however, were suitable for rice production. For James Island, the earliest staple crop was likely indigo, which would thrive on the moist loamy soils of the island.

By 1730, the majority of the populations of the colony, both rural and urban, was black (Wood 1974). Charleston was the mecca around which the economic, political, and social world of Carolina revolved. Charleston provided the essential opportunity for conspicuous consumption, a mechanism that allowed the display of wealth accumulated from the plantation

system.

The most obvious example of this is the economic hardship brought on by the American Revolution. Not only was the Charleston area the scene of many military actions, but Charleston itself was occupied by the British for over 22 years between 1780 and 1782. The loss of royal bounties on rice, indigo, and naval stores caused considerable economic chaos with the eventual "restructuring of the state's agricultural and commercial base" (Brockington et al. 1985:34).

Settlement on James Island at the time of the American Revolution was sparse. A map prepared at the time of the Revolution reveals no settlements in the vicinity of the project area, although a church and an unnamed settlement are located to the south on one of the island's major roads (Figure 7).

One means of "restructuring" after the Revolution was the emergence of cotton as the principal cash crop. Although "upland" cotton was available as early as 1733, its ascendancy was ensured by the industrial revolution, the invention of the cotton gin in 1794, and the availability of slave labor. While "Sea Island" cotton was already being efficiently cleaned, the spread of cotton was primarily in the South Carolina interior. Consequently, Charleston benefited primarily through its role as a commercial center.

Cotton provided about 20 years of economic success for South Carolina. During this period South Carolina monopolized cotton production with a number of planters growing wealthy (Mason 1976). The price of cotton fell in 1819 and remained low through the 1820s, primarily because of competition from planters in Alabama and Mississippi. Friedlander, in Wheaton et al. (1983:28-29) notes that cotton






Figure 8. Portion of Mills' *Atlas* showing the project area on James Island.

production in the inland coastal parishes fell by 25% in the years from 1821 to 1839, although national production increased by 123%. Production improved dramatically in the 1840s in spite of depressed prices and in the 1850s the price of cotton rose.

The 1825 Mills' *Atlas* shows the project area on James Island (Figure 8). No settlements are shown on the project tract. Several settlements are shown in close proximity, however, including J. Rivers, W. Rivers, S. Rivers, and Holmes. Bache's map shown from the same time period shows the project area in wetland (Figure 9).

The Civil War history of James Island has been discussed at length by several authors. In particular, Brennan (1996) provides a detailed account of the nearby Secessionville battle and of the

events leading up to it.

With the election of Lincoln and the fall of Fort Sumter, the Civil War began. But it was the fall of the Confederate positions around Hilton Head and Beaufort, coupled with the Union blockade of the coast that made the South realize its vulnerability. Shortly afterward, the little known General Robert E. Lee arrived in Charleston to assume command of the new military department of South Carolina, Georgia, and East Florida. Lee established his command at Coosawhatchie, on the line of the Charleston and Savannah Railroad. His

strategy, in the words of Rose was:

To concede the immediate coast (a move that did not sit well with the planters of the area) except for the forts guarding Charleston and Savannah, which he greatly




Figure 9. Portion of Bache's "Charleston Harbour and the Adjacent Coast and Country," 1823-1825.

improved; to obstruct all the waterways between the two cities not already occupied by the Union navy; and to protect the railroad (Rosen 1994:83).

As the Union forces delayed, Charleston continued to strengthen its defenses. Lee placed General Roswell S. Ripley over the Charleston district. By March 1862, Lee was replaced by Major General John C. Pemberton, an individual almost universally disliked by Charlestonians. Rosen notes that Pemberton relieved Ripley of his command and was never able to get along with South Carolina's Governor Pickens. Soon Charleston was under martial law and the local paper cried that this was "grievous and intolerable oppression - an unreasonable and tyrannical measure" (quoted in Rosen 1994:89).

In spite of the measures taken by Lee, Ripley, and then Pemberton, the large rivers of coastal South Carolina were a serious weakness in the defense of Charleston since they allowed numerous entrances and routes of movement - most difficult to protect or defend. Coupled with this natural weakness, Pemberton decided to draw his defenses inward toward Charleston and abandoned the fortifications at Cole's Island on the Stono Inlet. Combined, these two were seized by the Federal navy, which began a gradual movement up the Carolina coast from Port Royal, first to Cole's Island, to Edisto Island, to Seabrook Island, then to Johns and Kiawah islands, then finally digging in on Folly Island. This created a staging area for the assault on Charleston.

Among the Confederates' greatest fears was that the Union army would launch an assault on James Island, since if it fell, artillery batteries on the island would almost certainly lay waste to the inner harbor defenses. As a result, extensive defensive batteries began to be erected on James Island. On May 29, 1862, under the increased

threat of invasion by Union forces, Major John G. Pressly, commander of the Eutaw Regiment (25<sup>th</sup> S.C. Volunteer Infantry) at Secessionville (to the east of the project area) and Provost Marshal for James Island, ordered that the island be evacuated. The notice in the *Charleston Mercury* instructed the planters to remove all private property, including slaves. Corn, fodder, and livestock would be purchased by the Quartermaster and used for provisioning troops then protecting Charleston.

No batteries appear to have been built in or near the project area.

After the Civil War, Charleston and the surrounding countryside lay in waste. Plantation




Figure 10. Portion of the 1919 James Island topographic map showing the project area.

houses were destroyed, the city was in near ruins, the agricultural base of slavery was destroyed, and the economic system was in chaos. Rebuilding after the war involved two primary tasks: forging a new relationship between white land owners and black freedmen, and creating a new economic order through credit merchants.

In terms of relative importance, cotton and livestock were the two most important agricultural activities in Charleston County,



followed by truck farming and grain production. During the early postbellum period there is also evidence of some land consolidation – four tracts in excess of 1,000 acres in 1870 had increased to 151 tracts by 1880. Probably caused by high property taxes, foreclosures, and low selling prices this trend continued only for a decade (Scardaville in Brockington et al. 1985:57). During the late postbellum, tenancy increased dramatically throughout South Carolina, except for several coastal areas where Scardaville suggests black farmers were able to purchase small tracts. Where tenancy did exist, it was largely cash rental, not sharecropping, and Scardaville argues that this formed the vital link allowing black ownership (Scardaville in Brockington et al. 1985:62).

Beginning shortly after the Civil War, truck farming became one of the primary agricultural activities of area farmers. The combination of soil fertility, climate, and proximity gave truck farming an edge in the effort to supply Charleston with produce.

As a result, many blacks were employed as wage laborers. Produce increased from about one-quarter of the county's agricultural production in 1890 to over three-quarters by 1930 (Scardaville in Brockington et al. 1985:74). Much of this prosperity, however, disappeared during the Great Depression, when truck farming in the area declined by 75%.

A 1919 topographic map (Figure 10) shows several structures, including one church, near the project area, however none of these structures were located on the current parcel.

The 1942 *General Highway and Transportation Map of Charleston County* (Figure 11) shows the project area surrounded multiple structures, including farm units and single dwellings. None of these, however, were located on the project tract.




Figure 11. Portion of the 1942 *General Highway and Transportation Map of Charleston County* showing the project area.

## RESEARCH METHODS AND FINDINGS

### Archaeological Field Methods and Findings

The initially proposed field techniques involved the placement of shovel tests at 100-foot intervals along transects that were placed at 100-foot intervals along the north edge of the tract. Shovel testing would be performed to the south to the edge of the property.

All soil would be screened through  $\frac{1}{4}$ -inch mesh, with each test numbered sequentially. Each test would measure about 1 foot square and would normally be taken to a depth of 0.8 to 2.0 feet or until subsoil was encountered. All cultural remains would be collected, except for mortar and brick, which would be quantitatively noted in the field and discarded. Notes would be maintained for profiles at any sites encountered.

Should sites (defined by the presence of three or more artifacts from either surface survey

or shovel tests within a 50 feet area) be identified, further tests would be used to obtain data on site boundaries, artifact quantity and diversity, site integrity, and temporal affiliation. These tests would be placed at 25 to 50 feet intervals in a simple cruciform pattern until two consecutive negative shovel tests were encountered. The information required for completion of South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology site forms would be collected and photographs would be taken, if warranted in the opinion of the field investigators.

Analysis of collections would follow professionally accepted standards with a level of intensity suitable to the quantity and quality of the remains.

A total of 20 shovel tests were excavated along 10 transect lines.








Figure 13. View of structures adjacent to the project area.

Nevertheless, the archaeological survey of the tract failed to identify any remains. This is likely due to the lack of well drained soils and the distance from the Ashley River, a primary transportation route in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

### **Architectural Survey**

As previously discussed, we elected to use a 0.5 mile area of potential effect (APE). The architectural survey would record buildings, sites, structures, and objects that appeared to have been constructed before 1950. Typical of such projects, this survey recorded only those which have retained "some measure of its historic integrity" (Vivian n.d.:5) and which were visible from public roads.

For each identified resource we would complete a Statewide Survey Site Form and at least two representative photographs were taken. Permanent control numbers would be assigned by the Survey Staff of the S.C. Department of Archives and History at the conclusion of the study. The Site Forms for the resources identified during this study would be submitted to the S.C. Department of Archives and History.

### **Site Evaluation and Findings**

Archaeological sites would be evaluated for further work based on the eligibility criteria for the National Register of Historic Places. Chicora Foundation only provides an opinion of National Register eligibility and the final determination is made by the lead federal agency, in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer at the South Carolina Department of Archives

and History.

The criteria for eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places is described by 36CFR60.4, which states:

the quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and

a. that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

b. that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or

c. that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or

that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

d. that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

*National Register Bulletin* 36 (Townsend et al. 1993) provides an evaluative process that contains five steps for forming a clearly defined explicit rationale for either the site's eligibility or lack of eligibility. Briefly, these steps are:

- identification of the site's data sets or categories of archaeological information such as ceramics, lithics, subsistence remains, architectural remains, or sub-surface features;
- identification of the historic context applicable to the site, providing a framework for the evaluative process;
- identification of the important research questions the site might be able to address, given the data sets and the context;
- evaluation of the site's archaeological integrity to ensure that the data sets were sufficiently well preserved to address the research questions; and
- identification of important



Figure 14. Shovel testing in the project area.

research questions among all of those which might be asked and answered at the site.

This approach, of course, has been developed for use documenting eligibility of sites being actually nominated to the National Register of Historic Places where the evaluative process must stand alone, with relatively little reference to other documentation and where typically only one site is being considered. As a result, some aspects of the evaluative process have been summarized, but we try to focus on an archaeological site's ability to address significant research topics within the context of its available data sets.

While six resources were noted by Fick et al. (1989), five of these, 1324 (a house on Grimball Road), 1325 (a house at 1550 Grimball Road), 1327 (the Halter House), 1327.01 (Stewart House), and 1327.02 (Halter Office) have been determined not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Resource 1326, the W.L. Limehouse House, is potentially eligible for the National Register, however, none of these resources can be seen from the current project area. The identified Civil War battery (#4), as previously mentioned, was destroyed in 1965 for residential development.

Battery 5, which is on the National Register, cannot be seen from the project area due to a dense forest. In addition, several residential subdivisions have been constructed between the Battery and the current project area. The Secessionville Historic District is close to 1.0 mile from the project area, and like Battery 5, cannot be seen due to dense forest and residential neighborhoods.

The current project should have no affect on the National Register properties or on the other identified resources in the 0.5 mile APE.

## CONCLUSIONS

This study involved the examination of an approximately 4.5 acre tract of land for a residential neighborhood on James Island in Charleston County. This work, conducted for Mr. Joe Margarite, examined archaeological sites and cultural resources found in the proposed project area and is intended to assist the client in complying with their historic preservation responsibilities.

As a result of this investigation no sites were identified. This is likely the result of the lack of well drained soils and the distance from the River.

A survey of public roads within 0.5 mile revealed no additional structures beyond those identified in the 1989 survey (Fick et al. 1989) that retain their integrity for the National Register of Historic Places. None of the identified resources

will be affected by the proposed project. Dense forest separates the resources from the current project area while residential neighborhoods have already affected the integrity of the sites.

It is possible that archaeological remains may be encountered during construction activities. As always, contractors should be advised to report any discoveries of concentrations of artifacts (such as bottles, ceramics, or projectile points) or brick rubble to the project engineer, who should in turn report the material to the State Historic Preservation Office, or Chicora Foundation (the process of dealing with late discoveries is discussed in 36CFR800.13(b)(3)). No further land altering activities should take place in the vicinity of these discoveries until they have been examined by an archaeologist and, if necessary, have been processed according to 36CFR800.13(b)(3).



## SOURCES CITED

- Allston, R.F.W.  
1854 *Essay on Sea Coast Crops*. A.E. Miller, Charleston.
- Brennan, Patrick  
1996 *Secessionville: Assault on Charleston*. Savas Publishing Company, Campbell, California.
- Brockinton, Paul, Michael Scardaville, Patrick H. Garrow, David Singer, Linda France, and Cheryl Holt  
1985 *Rural Settlement in the Charleston By Area: Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Sites in the Mark Clark Expressway Corridor*. Garrow and Associates, Inc., Atlanta.
- Brooks, Mark J., Larry Lepionka, Ted A. Rathbun, and John Goldsborough  
1982 *Preliminary Archaeological Investigations at the Callawassie Island Burial Mound (38BU19), Beaufort County, South Carolina*. Research Manuscript Series 185. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- Burton, Milby E.  
1970 *The Siege of Charleston 1861-1865*. University of South Carolina Press, Columbia.
- Butler, C.S.  
1994 *Draft Report. Archaeological Survey and Testing of the Martschink Development Tract, Secessionville, Charleston County, South Carolina*. Brockington and Associates, Atlanta.
- Carpenter, James G.  
1973 *The Rice Plantation Lands of Georgetown County, South Carolina: A Historical Geographic Study*. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Department of Geography. University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- Coe, Joffre L.  
1964 *The Formative Cultures of the Carolina Piedmont*. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 54(5).
- Cooke, C. Wythe  
1936 *Geology of the Coastal Plain of South Carolina*. Bulletin 867. U.S. Geological Survey, Washington, D.C.
- Coon, David L.  
1972 *The Development of Market Agriculture in South Carolina*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois. University microfilms, Ann Arbor.
- Derting, Keith M., Sharon L. Pehrul, and Charles J. Rinehart  
1991 *A Comprehensive Bibliography of South Carolina Archaeology*. Research Manuscript 211. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- Dunbar, Gary S.  
1961 *Colonial Carolina Cowpens*. *Agricultural History* 35:125-130.

---

CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY OF THE SECESSIONVILLE ROAD TRACT

---

- Edgar, Walter B., editor  
 1972 *The Letterbook of Robert Pringle*. 2 vols. University of South Carolina Press, Columbia.
- Fick, Sarah  
 1992 *Charleston County Historical and Architectural Survey*. Preservation Consultants, Inc., Charleston, South Carolina.
- Fick, Sarah, David Schneider, and Robert P. Stockton  
 1989 *James Island and Johns Island Historic Survey*. Preservation Consultants, Inc., Charleston, South Carolina.
- Fraser, Walter J., Jr.  
 1989 *Charleston! Charleston! The History of a Southern City*. University of South Carolina Press, Columbia.
- Hammond, Henry  
 1884 Report on Cotton Production of the State of South Carolina. In *Report on the Cotton Production in the United States*, edited by Eugene W. Hilgard, pp. 451-526. Census Office, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.
- Hilliard, Sam B.  
 1984 *Atlas of Antebellum Southern Agriculture*. Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge.
- Huneycutt, Philip K.  
 1949 *The Economics of the Indigo Industry in South Carolina*. Unpublished MA thesis. Department of Economics, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- Kjerfve, Bjorn  
 1975 *Climatology of Kiawah Island*. In *Environmental Inventory of Kiawah Island*, edited by William M. Campbell and John Mark Dean, pp. C-1 - C-34. Environmental Research Center, Inc., Columbia.
- Lefler, Hugh T., editor  
 1967 *Lawson's A New Voyage to Carolina*. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.
- Lepionka, Larry, Donald Colquhoun, Rochelle Marrinan, David McCollum, Mark Brooks, John Foss, William Abbott, and Ramona Grunden  
 1983 *The Second Refuge Site, Location 22 (38JA61), Savannah National Wildlife Refuge, Jasper County, South Carolina*. University of South Carolina, Beaufort, Submitted to National Park Service, Inter-agency Archaeological Services, Atlanta.
- Mason, Robert E.  
 1976 *A Historical Geography of South Carolina's Sea Island Cotton Industry*. Unpublished MA thesis, Department of Geography, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- Mathews, Maurice  
 1954 A Contemporary View of Carolina in 1686. *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 55:153-159.
- Mathews, Thomas, Frank Stapor, Jr., Charles Richter, John Miglarese, Michael McKenzie, and Lee Barclay  
 1980 *Ecological Characterization of the Sea Island Region of South Carolina and Gerogia*, volume 1. Office of Biological Services, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C.
- Michie, James  
 1977 *The Late Pleistocene Human Occupation of South Carolina*.

# SOURCES CITED

- Unpublished Honor's Thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- Miller, E.N.  
1971 *Soil Survey of Charleston County, South Carolina*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.
- Mills, Robert  
1972[1826]*Statistics of South Carolina*. Hurlbut and Lloyd, Charleston, South Carolina. 1972 facsimile ed. The Reprint Company, Spartanburg, South Carolina.
- Morgan, Philip D.  
1977 *Development of Slave Culture in Eighteenth Century Plantation America*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University College, London.
- Peterson, Drexel  
1971 *Time and Settlement in the Archaeology of Groton Plantation, South Carolina*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Department of Anthropology, Harvard University, Cambridge.
- Rosen, Robert  
1982 *A Short History of Charleston*. Lexikos, San Francisco.
- 1994 *Confederate Charleston: An Illustrated History of the City and the People During the Civil War*. University of South Carolina Press, Columbia.
- Sandifer, Paul A., John V. Miglarese, Dale R. Calder, John J. Manzi, and Lee A. Barclay  
1980 *Ecological Characterization of the Sea Island Coastal Region of South Carolina and Georgia*, vol. 3. Office of Biological Services, Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C.
- Sirmans, H. Eugene  
1966 *Colonial South Carolina: A Political History, 1663-1763*. University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
- South, Stanley  
1971 *Archaeology at the Charles Towne Site (38CH1) on Albemarle Point in South Carolina*. Research Manuscript Series 10. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- 1972 *The Unabridged Version of Tribes of the Carolina Lowlands: Pedee-Sewee-Winyaw-Waccamaw-Cape Fear-Congaree-Wateree-Santee*. Research Manuscript Series 20. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- Thomas, David H. and Clark S. Larsen  
1979 *The Anthropology of St. Catherine's Island: The Refuge-Deptford Mortuary Complex*. Anthropological Papers 56(1). American Museum of Natural History, New York.
- Townsend, Jan, John H. Sprinkle, Jr., and John Knoerl  
1993 *Guidelines for Evaluating and Registering Historical Archaeological Sites and Districts*. Bulletin 36. National Park Service, National Register of Historic Places, Washington, D.C.
- Trinkley, Michael  
1980 *Investigation of the Woodland Period Along the South Carolina Coast*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of



---

CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY OF THE SECESSIONVILLE ROAD TRACT

---

- North Carolina at Chapel Hill,  
University Microfilms, Ann  
Arbor.
- Historic Properties. State Historic  
Preservation Office, Columbia.
- 1981 *Studies of Three Woodland Period  
Sites in Beaufort County, South  
Carolina.* South Carolina  
Department of Highways and  
Public Transportation, Columbia.
- 1983 *Yaughan and Curriboo Plantations:  
Studies in African American  
Archaeology.* Soil Systems, Inc.,  
Marietta, Georgia.
- 1982 *A Summary Report of Excavations  
at Alligator Creek, Charleston  
County, South Carolina.* U.S.D.A.,  
Forest Service, Columbia.
- Williams, Stephen B., editor  
1968 *The Waring Papers: The Collected  
Works of Antonio J. Waring, Jr.*  
Papers of the Peabody Museum  
of Archaeology and Ethnology  
58.
- 1983 *Ceramics of the Central South  
Carolina Coast.* *South Carolina  
Antiquities* 15:43-53.
- Wilson, Homes H.  
1982 *An Analysis of Skeletal Material  
from Bw<sup>o</sup>67, Brunswick County,  
North Carolina.* Unpublished MA  
thesis, Department of  
Anthropology, University of  
North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
- 1984 *The Archaeology of Sol Legare  
Island, Charleston County, South  
Carolina.* Research Series 1.  
Chicora Foundation, Inc.,  
Columbia.
- Trinkley, Michael and Sarah Fick  
2000 *A Survey of Civil War Fortifications  
in Charleston, Beaufort, Berkeley,  
Hampton, and Jasper Counties,  
South Carolina.* Research Series  
59. Chicora Foundation,  
Columbia.
- Wood, Peter  
1974 *Black Majority.* W.W. Norton,  
New York.
- Trinkley, Michael and Debi Hacker  
1997 *Excavations at a Portion of the  
Secessionville Archaeological Site  
(38CH1456), James Island,  
Charleston County, South Carolina.*  
Research Series 52. Chicora  
Foundation, Inc., Columbia.
- Ver Steeg, Clarence  
1975 *Origins of a Southern Mosaic.*  
University of Georgia Press,  
Athens.
- Vivian, Daniel J.  
n.d. *South Carolina Statewide Survey of*

**Archaeological  
Investigations**

**Historical Research**

**Preservation**

**Education**

**Interpretation**

**Heritage Marketing**

**Museum Support  
Programs**



**Chicora Foundation, Inc.**  
PO Box 8664 • 861 Arbutus Drive  
Columbia, SC 29202-8664  
Tel: 803-787-6910  
Fax: 803-787-6910  
Email: [Chicora@earthlink.net](mailto:Chicora@earthlink.net)  
[www.chicora.org](http://www.chicora.org)